



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/955,222

09/19/2001

Richard Brown

1509-220

8293

22879

7590

05/24/2006

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY

P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION

FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

DINH, KHANH Q

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2151

DATE MAILED: 05/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

09/955,222

Applicant(s)

BROWN ET AL.

Examiner

Khanh Dinh

Art Unit

2151

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 01 May 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: none.
Claim(s) objected to: none.
Claim(s) rejected: 1-21.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: none.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.

Khanh Dinh

Khanh Dinh
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 2151

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant asserts that in the Spies (US 5,689,565) citations (col.7 line 14 to col.8 line 63 and col.10 lines 10-65), the Applicant can't find "the cid is the credential index...defined for the credential by the domain authority".

The Examiner admit the typo error. Instead, the secondary reference (Schiedt, US 6,754,820) also discloses about the credential index as cited above (see col.12 lines 5-16). In addition, Spies discloses a Registration process in the cited citation (col.4 to col.8 line 63 and col.10 lines 10-65), the Applicant's credential index such as using a credential binding server (28 fig.3) to verify the authenticity of the registration packets sent by the participants (24a, 24b, 24c, fig.1). Spies's credential binding server also decrypts and performs a two-step verification technique to verify whether the packet came from the participant. If the verification success, the credential creates a unique credential for each participant for future transactions. This teaching of Spies meets the Applicant claim as credential index. Therefore, the claims are properly rejected.

Applicant further asserts that the cited reference does not disclose causing a recipient to respond to an index communicated by the sender related to at least one credential corresponding at least selected one credential.

Examiner respectfully point out that Spies discloses the Applicant's claimed invention by using the credential binding server to attach a digital signature of the trusted credential authority to the credential. The binder's digital signature will be used by participants (sender 22b, recipient 22a fig.1) for conducting commerce transaction process and commercial activities (see col.10 line 61 to col.11 line 51).

The Applicant asserts that there is no foundation for combining the references.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no foundation to combine the references, the fact that applicant has recognized another advantage which would flow naturally from following the suggestion of the prior art cannot be the basis for patentability when the differences would otherwise be obvious. See *Ex parte Obiaya*, 227 USPQ 58, 60 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985). In this case, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Schiedt's secret credentials into the computer system of Spies to restrict accesses to data information because it would have provided sensitivity level or multiple-level access control such that access to credentials is dependant on the method of member identification and enforced domain authority dictated policies for multiple-level access control by credential category (see Schiedt's col.3 lines 3-32).